REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement dated February 28, 2006, Applicants elect group I directed to the device, including original claims 1-12, 14 and 15, as amended, and new claims 16-20. New claim 16 is directed to the preferred silicon carbide set forth in original claim 6. New claims 17 and 18 mirror claim 2 but are dependent on claims 3 and 4, respectively, and finally new claim 19 mirrors claim 12 but is dependent on claim 18. New independent claim 20 is similar to claim 1.

With respect to the merits of the restriction requirement, the restriction divides the claims into product claims (group I) and process of use claims (group II). Applicants respectfully point out that once a product (device) claim is allowed and a process of use claim is provided which is dependent on an allowed product claim, there would be no need to make any further search because the nature of the device itself would provide patentability to the claim. Under such circumstances, Applicants intend to request rejoinder of the method claim with an allowed claim to the device. See also MPEP §821.04.

It is also seen that the claims are amended so as to utilize conventional patent terminology, while not restricting the scope of the claims in any way.

It is also noted for the record, that an election of species was previously made and responded to on September 9, 2005, supplemented by Applicants further response of November 28, 2005.

In view of this response to the restriction requirement, an early action on the merit of the application is courteously requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400 2200 Clarendon Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22201 Telephone: (703) 243-6333

Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: PET-2131

Date: March 24, 2006

IWM:pdr